DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 757 FL 024 844

TITLE	JALT96 Final Panel.
PUB DATE	1997-08-00
NOTE	11p.; Section Seven of: On JALT96: Crossing Borders. Proceedings of the Annual JALT International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning (23rd, Hiroshima, Japan, November 1996); see FL 024 837.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Applied Linguistics; Change Strategies; *Cultural Pluralism; Educational Change; Educational Trends; Ethics; Foreign Countries; *Language Role; *Language Teachers; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; Social Responsibility; *Teacher Responsibility; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The summary papers of the conference on second language teaching include (1) a summary of the concluding panel discussion (Kip Cates, Denis Cunningham, Albert Raasch, Braj Kachru, Carol Rinnert) on the role of languages and the responsibility of language education in lowering cultural barriers, the ethical responsibility of language professionals, and areas in which applied linguistics has not met the intercultural challenge, and (2) the full texts of the remarks by Braj B. Kachru on the ethical responsibility of language professionals and shortcomings in applied linguistics. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 757

Section Seven
Final Panel

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gene Van
Troyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024844

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JALT FINAL PANEL
Crossing Borders: Making Connections

Kip Cates
Tottori University

Participants:

Kip Cates, (Moderator) ***Tottori University,*** **Japan**
Denis Cunningham, ***Victoria School of Languages,*** **Australia**
Albert Raasch, ***Saarland University,*** **Germany**
Braj Kachru, ***University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,*** **USA**
Carol Rinnert, ***Hiroshima City University,*** **Japan**

This panel, the final session of the conference, addressed the JALT97 conference theme Crossing Borders: Making Connections. The moderator was Kip Cates, coordinator of JALTs Global Issues N-SIG. The four panelists were: (1) Denis Cunningham, secretary of the World Federation of Modern Language Associations (FIPLV), secretary of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) and organizer of the 1995 UNESCO Linguapax V conference in Australia; (2) Braj Kachru, Center for Advanced Study Professor of Linguistics and Jubilee Professor of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA; (3) Albert Raasch, professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Saarland, Germany and editor of the 1991 UNESCO Linguapax book Peace through Language Teaching; and (4) Carol Rinnert, JALT96 conference co-chair and Professor of International Studies at Hiroshima City University, Japan.

Introduction

Kip Cates, the moderator, began the session by outlining the theme of the panel and its focus on borders, barriers and connections. Barriers facing language educators, he said, can be either physical, psychological, geographic, linguistic or educational. As teachers, he said, we often create our own borders by the narrow, unconsidered views we may hold about language teaching and learning. By making connections with new teaching approaches and philosophies, we can move beyond the traditional ABCs of education - Alienation, Boredom and Control. Another border that prevents better language teaching, he said, is the border between disciplines. By making connections with other foreign language teachers - teachers of French, German or Japanese, for example - English language teachers can learn new ideas to improve their teaching. By making connections with other curriculum areas - social studies, science or math - language teachers can promote cross-curriculum cooperation and the integration of meaningful content. And by making connections with fields such as global education and peace education, he said, language teachers can give their work new relevance and inspire their students with a sense of world citizenship and an understanding of global issues.

Denis Cunningham: A School Model from Australia

The first speaker, Denis Cunningham, began his talk by explaining that the goal of

overcoming barriers, crossing borders and making connections can be achieved through successful language teaching and learning. The challenge, he said, is to ensure that our language teaching is effective. When this is the case, the learning of languages by our students will facilitate the objective of overcoming linguistic barriers and enable students to cross those cultural borders which inhibit establishing connections with new peoples, cultures and ways of viewing the world. While accepting that there is value in learning about other peoples, cultures and global issues, Cunningham stressed that it is through thorough and effective language learning that we can successfully arrive at essential intercultural understanding and tolerance, and learn to comprehend the world from anothers linguistic, cultural and personal standpoint.

Cunningham then described a number of initiatives involving his institution, the Victorian School of Languages (VSL), perhaps the largest language school in the world, where over 40 languages are taught to 12,000 students in 636 classes at 29 centres. The languages currently on offer are:

> Albanian, Arabic, Amharic, Bengali, Bosnian, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, Dari, Dutch, Estonian, Farsi, French, German, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Khmer, Kurdish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Maltese, Modern Greek, Polish, Portuguese, Pushtu, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala, Slovenian, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese (and Latin by distance mode).

With its diversity of cultures, religions, races, and geographical provenances, Cunningham said, VSL is a microcosm of Australian society and an excellent model of inter-racial harmony.

Cunningham explained how, at VSL, several languages are spoken by communities or countries where tension or war - recent or current - strains the reality of peace. The environment of tolerance, harmony and unity within VSL, he said, serves to attenuate or eradicate such tension in students who have recently arrived, or whose parents immigrated some years ago, from less harmonious situations across the globe. He then cited examples which demonstrate, in different ways, the means of tackling tension, confronting conflict and promoting peace to accelerate the acceptance of others.

Croatian and Serbian Despite the conflict within the former Yugoslavia and the resulting tension between these two communities in Australia, the VSL has four centres where both these languages are taught side by side, with no appreciable evidence of this global conflict.
Arabic VSL offers Arabic language classes as a catalyst for drawing together Arabic and non-Arabic speakers from different countries and even different religions, with Coptic Christians joining Muslims to learn Arabic. One instructor was born in Nazareth, speaks Arabic as a first language, Hebrew as a second language, and is a Christian. She and others defy stereotyping. This particular teacher commented as follows on the role of Arabic language teaching in helping students cross borders and make connections.

In Australia, students from different Arabic backgrounds experience different relationships with each other than those experienced by their parents and relatives in their homelands. Tolerance and acceptance are more likely to be created among our students in Australia. When these students come together for Saturday classes, they notice the differences in dialect and, as they befriend each other, these differences are acknowledged. Friendship on the one hand and common Arabic literacy, traditions and history create among these students a new Arabic unity missed by many of their parents.

Portuguese In a senior class of Portuguese, where students are of Portuguese, Australian, East Timorese, Spanish and Italian background, the language learning program prepared by the teacher, Anabela Sobrinho, is based on the following Linguapax themes:

- Cultural Tolerance in a Multicultural Society
- Elimination of Social Discrimination

- Globalisation
- Environmental Awareness
- World Population
- Portuguese Discoveries and Today's Situation -from Greed to Peace?
- Creative Resolution of Domestic and Multicultural Conflicts
- Human Rights

Cunningham concluded by arguing that an approach like that at VSL can create an environment conducive to peace through the teaching of languages in a multilingual, multicultural context.

Braj Kachru: Uncomfortable Questions

The second panelist, Braj Kachru, raised what he said were two uncomfortable questions that the English teaching profession has generally pushed under the rug.

The first relates to social relevance and the social responsibilities of professionals. It is only very recently that professionals in language-related fields have begun to engage publicly in self-evaluation and in raising issues of an ethical nature. While the practice of self-evaluation is frequently adopted by sister disciplines such as political science and sociology, he said, it is somewhat disturbing that professionals in applied linguistics have been by and large indifferent to these concerns. This ostrich-like attitude, he said, is evident in two ways: first, in the way applied linguists view the applications and effects of the linguistic sciences on the public; second, in the way applied linguists overlook - at least in print - the ethical implications of various endeavors in which the profession is engaged. Kachru touched on the suspicion of the general public towards linguistics in the 1960s and cited Bolinger (1980:1):

> In language, there are no licensed practitioners, but the woods are full of midwives, herbalists, colonic irrigationists, bone setters and general-purpose witch doctors - some abysmally ignorant, others with a rich fund of practical knowledge - whom one shall lump together and call SHAMANS.

He contrasted the ethical issues debated by applied linguists in the 1960s - prescriptivism, usage and standardization - with the current concerns of applied linguistics - power, identity, ideology and control - articulated by scholars such as John Firth, Michael Halliday, Dell Hymes and William Labov. These ethical issues - such as the linguistic power to define and control - are particularly relevant at present given the unprecedented power of one language across cultures when agendas for research are primarily set in Western contexts, a consequence of educational and economic inequalities and of indifference toward Asian and African needs. Studies in these areas are relevant to the traditional concerns of applied linguists: program development, language planning, and curriculum development. By questioning current paradigms and practices, we can address issues related to the roles of professional organizations and their channels of communication (journals, newsletters, conferences). In an ethical sense, he said, linguists have been essentially social side-liners and not social critics.

The second concern Kachru raised relates to what he calls the leaks in applied linguistics. These relate to the identity of the field and its theoretical foundations. They go beyond identity and theory to manifest themselves in applied linguistic research - for example, what Butler terms the ELT empire (Butler, 1996) - and in applied linguistic and ELT professional organizations. These leaks, he said, are of four types:

- **Theoretical leaks:** These refer to the identity crisis of applied linguistics in terms of the characterization and goals of the field. This involves not only conceptualization between the sociological vs. psychological approaches (Halliday vs. Chomsky) but also between the paradigms of applied linguistics generally followed in the USA and the UK.

- **Methodological leaks:** These are of three types. The first involves conceptualizations of speech communities with reference to English, particularly in what has been termed the Third World. This is not merely a question of definitions but relates to societal realism, language use and,

interaction. types of input, and types of creativity. The second involves indifference towards the sociolinguistic contexts and consumers of applied linguistic research in the developing world. The third relates to the introduction of pedagogical method as the proverbial Procrustean bed: the view that all cultures, all speech communities, all users of language must fit into one mould. This is particularly true of current research on genre analysis and ESP.

- **Pragmatic leaks:** These relate to issues such as linguistic models and their relevance to the contexts of Asia and Africa, and paradigms which result in various types of inequality.

- **Ethical leaks:** For these, we must pay attention to Bolingers warning that truth is a linguistic question, and that ethical values must receive professional attention.

It is rewarding to ask ourselves, Kachru concluded: What are the underlying reasons for our perceptions of a speech community? What are the implications of our descriptive labels? Do some of us use our access to language and cultures with motives which are open to question? These are ethical questions, he said, which the profession at large must address.

Albert Raasch: A Perspective from Germany

The third panelist, Albert Raasch, began his talk by referring to the panel theme crossing borders and by discussing four different types of border - physical, cultural and psychological - that exist in his native country, Germany. The first type of border, he said, is national borders between countries. In contrast to Japan, an island country, Germany, is a nation of borders, surrounded by nine different countries - France, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg. The German awareness of national borders and the role of these borders in shaping German history, culture, society and the German view of foreign peoples and languages, is, therefore, large.

In addition to national borders between countries, Germany is also marked by another type of geographical border - that between regions. The geographical, social and psychological border between the former East Germany and West Germany, Raasch said, constitutes a kind of internal border in now reunified Germany that is reflected in the language learning experience of each region. Another border that exists is the border between different kinds of German citizens, for example, between native-born Germans and newly arrived immigrants from other countries. A fourth kind of border is the border between generations, between the older generation which experienced WWII and the Cold War and the new younger post-Cold War generation of modern Germany. All these borders, whether physical, regional, ethnic or generational, impact on the teaching and learning of foreign languages and on the promotion of mutual understanding. In the same way, language teaching can also help to bridge these various borders between different nations, regions, cultures and generations, and thus work to promote peace.

If we look at education, he said, there is one final border that we must be aware of - the border between teachers and students. Teachers must be aware of the gulf that can exist in the classroom between teachers and learners, and must do their best to bridge that gulf and to see things from the learners perspectives. Raasch concluded by describing a number of European initiatives in cross border exchanges which involved language learning and the promotion of international understanding.

Carol Rinnert: Crossing Borders, Making Assumptions

The fourth panelist, Carol Rinnert, outlined what she felt were common barriers and important connections for the field of foreign language teaching. She first touched on her role as JALT96 conference organizer and her mixed feelings in choosing the theme: crossing borders. Perhaps, she said, this should have been changed to eliminating borders or making borders fuzzy. She then went on to raise a number of assumptions concerning language teaching

and learning which she felt served to create barriers between people and prevent more effective foreign language education. One set of assumptions related to language teaching in Japan while another set was relevant to the academic world generally.

For Japan, Rinnert discussed the following four assumptions:

Assumption #1: "Non-Japanese teachers of foreign languages are not qualified to make academic decisions in the Japanese context. This assumption, made by, among others, Japanese school administrators and program coordinators, prevents the active participation of native speaker teachers in program planning and development, and prevents effective cooperation between Japanese and non-Japanese teaching staff.

Assumption #2: "Only native English-speaking teachers can teach English conversation". This stereotype, held by members of the general public and by some in the Japanese English teaching establishment, denies capable Japanese and other teachers the chance to teach English communication skills solely on the basis of their nationality. At the same time, it reinforces the widespread belief that learning to communicate with native English speakers is more important than learning to communicate in English with non-native speakers, whereas the reality for a majority of students in Japan increasingly supports the opposite.

Assumption #3: Japanese students can never learn fluent English. This belief, held by both Japanese students and teachers, effectively blocks students from ever reaching this goal and results in half-hearted teaching and low motivation.

Assumption #4: Non-Japanese learners of Japanese as a foreign language can never learn fluent Japanese. This assumption, the flip side of assumption #3, prevents foreign learners of Japanese from reaching their potential and results in low teacher effort and expectations.

Rinnert went on to look at two additional assumptions that create barriers within the academic community.

Assumption #5: Applied linguists cant be serious academics. This belief, the result of academic snobbery by scholars in more theoretical disciplines, ignores the great progress in research and education made in the field of applied linguistics and serves as a justification for conferring low status and low salaries on applied linguists.

Assumption #6: Women cant be serious academics. This assumption, still alive today despite the progress made in raising awareness and eliminating sexism in society, prevents women from taking an equal role in academic research and education and denies them the chance to contribute their talents and ideas in the academic world.

Rinnert concluded by mentioning two connections she felt necessary to improve the effectiveness of language learning and intercultural understanding. The first is the connection that needs to be made between classroom language and real language use in the outside world. Too often, she said, classroom teaching tends to focus on language used to illustrate aspects of grammar rather than real uses of the language in communication. The second connection that needs to be made is a shift from stressing cross-cultural differences to acknowledging the human universals that transcend language differences.

References

Bolinger, D. (1980). *Language: The loaded weapon: The use and abuse of language today*. London: Longman, p. 1.

Butler, S. (1996) World English in an Asian context: The Macquarie Dictionary Project. *World Englishes*. 15.3.

JALT96: FINAL PANEL

Remarks by Braj B. Kachru
University of Illinois at Urbana

I believe that this concluding panel of JALT 1996 is the right place to raise a few questions and issues—rather uncomfortable ones—which the profession has generally pushed under the rug. I am grateful for this opportunity to share my concerns with you. The following two types of questions come to mind.

The first type of question relates to social *relevance* and social *responsibilities* of the professionals. It is only very recently that the professionals in language-related fields have begun to engage publicly in self-evaluation, in raising what may be called issues of an ethical nature.

This practice of self-evaluation is frequently adopted by a variety of sister disciplines: anthropology, political science, sociology, and even some literature departments. It is, therefore, somewhat disturbing that the professionals in applied linguistics have been by and large indifferent to these concerns. This ostrich-like attitude is evident in two ways: first, in the way applied linguists view the applications and effects of the linguistic sciences on the public; second, in the way applied linguists overlook—at least in print—the ethical implications of various endeavors in which the profession is engaged.

It was only a generation ago, in 1964, during the Structuralist phase in linguistics, that six architects of our discipline in the USA conceded that "a fair portion of highly educated laymen see in linguistics the great enemy of all they hold dear." These six gurus, Charles Ferguson, Morris Halle, Eric Hamp, Archibald Hill, Thomas Sebeok, and William Moulton, have in one role or another been our teachers and readers in their areas of specialization. And now, a generation later, one might ask: Has the situation changed during the past thirty years? Have linguists seriously worked to demonstrate the relevance of their discipline?

Sixteen years after that observation, the venerable Bolinger (1980:1) lamented that:

> In language there are no licensed practitioners, but the woods are full of midwives, herbalists, colonic irrigationists, bone setters and general-purpose witch doctors—some abysmally ignorant, others with a rich fund of practical knowledge—whom one shall lump together and call SHAMANS.

In the 1960s, and earlier, the debate on ethical issues in applying linguistics primarily focused on prescriptivism, usage, and standardization. Consider, for example, the controversies about *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged*, and other usage volumes. However, during the past three decades, within the new paradigms of the linguistic sciences, we find articulation of theoretical and methodological approaches which are redefining applied linguistics, its foundations, scope, and concerns.

The approaches I have specifically in mind are those of John R. Firth, Michael A. K. Halliday, Dell Hymes, and William Labov, to name just four. The concerns of applied linguistics now rightly include issues of power, identity, ideology, and control.

The recent studies discussing these topic and directly relevant to our profession raise refreshing and stimulating questions

about linguistic power—the power to define and the power to control. A detailed bibliography and a state-of-the-art survey is given in Kachru 1994 and 1997.

The ethical questions now being articulated have become especially meaningful in the present context, when there is overwhelming and unprecedented power of one language across cultures, when there is domination of Western research paradigms in the non-Western world, and when agendas for research are primarily outlined and set in the Western contexts. This situation is essentially a consequence of inequalities in education and economic resources and of indifference toward Asian and African research and needs.

I believe that these questions are being raised at just the right time. They provide stimuli for self-evaluation and reflection. And such studies have relevance to some of the traditional concerns of applied linguists: program development, language planning, and curriculum development (See, e.g., Tickoo ed. 1991).

By questioning the current paradigms and practices, we are able to address issues related to the roles of professional organizations and the channels of communication used by the leaders of such organizations (e.g., journals, newsletters, conferences, and conventions).

I hope that what I have said above provides a backdrop against which we can view the significance of this convention. The fact still remains that in an ethical sense, linguists have been, to quote Bolinger again (1973), essentially "social side-liners" and not social critics.

The other concern relates to what I have called earlier the "leaks" in applied linguistics (Kachru 1992). These "leaks" relate to the identity of the field and its theoretical foundations. These leaks go beyond identity and theory, however, and also manifest themselves in applied linguistic research, for example what Butler terms the "ELT empire" (1996), and in other areas of language-related fields. I am also thinking of the professional organizations that are involved in applied linguistics and ELT.

I am using the term "leak" here in more than one sense: to refer to the perceived limitations of the paradigms of applied linguistics, to refer to the overwhelming ideological and methodological biases of the paradigms, and to raise questions concerning ethical issues and professionalism in applied linguistics research. I might be more specific and say that the perceived 'leaks' are of four types: Theoretical, Methodological, Pragmatic, and Ethical. Let me briefly discuss these.

Theoretical leaks: By theoretical leak I mean the identity crisis of applied linguistics: Crisis in terms of characterization of the field and the goals of the *applied* enterprise. This does not involve only conceptualization between the sociological vs. psychological approaches (Halliday vs. Chomsky), but also between the paradigms of applied linguistics as generally followed in the USA and the UK (for further discussion and references see Kachru 1992 and 1996).

Methodological leaks: These are of three types. The first involves conceptualizations of "speech communities," with reference to English, particularly in what has been termed "the Third World." These questions are not merely of definitions but relate to societal realism, to language use and language interaction, to types of input, and to types of creativity. The second involves indifference toward the sociolinguistic contexts and consumers of *applied* research in the developing world. The third relates to the introduction of pedagogical method as the proverbial Procrustian bed: the view that all cultures, all speech communities, all users of language must fit into one mould. This is particularly true of current research on genre analysis and ESP.

Pragmatic leaks: Pragmatic concerns relate to issues such as linguistic models and their relevance to the contexts of Asia and Africa and paradigms which result in various types of inequality. These issues have been discussed in detail in Kachru 1986, Pennycook 1994, Phillipson 1992, Tollefson 1991, and Tsuda 1994a and 1994b.

Ethical leaks: We must pay attention to Bolinger's warning that "truth" is a linguistic question, and ethical values must

receive professional attention.

We will agree that all language-related fields are interrelated to various degrees. It is, therefore, rewarding to ask ourselves from time to time: What are the underlying reasons for our perceptions of a speech community? What are the implications of our descriptive labels? And do some of us use our access to language and cultures with motives which are open to question? The questions such self-examination raise are not just attitudinal, methodological, and theoretical: These are ethical questions which the profession at large must address.

The concerns I have expressed are not mutually exclusive. In one way or the other, they contribute to the linguistic *lameness* of those who are the consumers of our theoretical and applied research. And in some way all these relate to our profession—directly or indirectly. All these concerns are of vital importance to the Third World, but they are not exclusively the problems of the Third World. There is an extensive body of studies on this topic from the developed countries. Baugh (1988: 72) gives a moving description of his experiences in the USA (see also Connor-Linton and Adger, eds., 1993). He rightly cautions us that "a similar story could be told in many countries where race and language correspond to social stratification." The concerns, therefore, are common, and the limitations and exploitation of human language are shared across geographical, cultural, linguistic, and political boundaries.

References

Baugh, John. (1988) Language and Race: Some Implications for Linguistic Science. In *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey 1V Language: The Sociocultural Context*. Edited by F.J. Newmeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 64-74

Bolinger, Dwight L. (1980) *Language: The loaded weapon: The use and abuse of language today*. London: Longman.

Butler, Susan (1996) World English in an Asian context: The Macquarie Dictionary Project. *World Englishes*. 15.3.

Connor-Linton and Carolyn Temple Adger Guest eds. (1993) *Ethical issues for applying linguistics*. Special issue of *Issues in Applied Linguistics*.

Kachru, Braj B. (1986b) The power and politics of English. *World Englishes* 5.2-3, pp. 121-140.

Kachru, Braj B. (1992) Why applied linguistics leaks. Plenary address at the Annual Convention of American Association of Applied Linguistics. Seattle, Washington. February 28 - March 2, 1992.

Kachru, Braj B. (1993) Ethical issues for applying linguistics: Afterword. In Connor-Linton and Adger eds. 283-294.

Kachru, Braj B. (1994) World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. In *Readings on Second Language Acquisition*, edited by D. Brown and S. Gonzo, New York: Prencice-Hall. (an earlier version in *Language Teaching: The International Abstracting Journal of Language Teachers and Applied Linguistics* January. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-14.

Kachru, Braj B. (1995) Past imperfect. Plenary address at the Second International Conference on World Englishes, Nagoya, Japan, May 25-28, 1995.

Kachru, Braj B. (1996) The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes* 15.3.

Kachru, Braj B. (1997) World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phillipson, Robert (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tickoo, Makhan L. ed. (1991) *Language and standards: Issues, attitudes, case studies*. [Anthology Series 26]. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Tollefson, James W. (ed.) (1991) *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.

Tollefson, James W. (ed.) (1995) *Power and inequality in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsuda, Yukio (1994a) The hegemony of English in international communication. Paper presented at the annual convention of International Communication Association. Sydney, Australia.

Tsuda, Yukio (1994b) The diffusion of English: Its impact on culture and communication. *Keio Communication Review*. 16: 49-61.

Abstracts

Section One: Introduction

Crossing Borders: Some Values to Declare
Julian Edge

Abstract Not Available

Opening Borders with World Englishes: Theory in the Classroom
Braj B. Kachru

Abstract Not Available

Section Two: Teacher Development

Mosaics of Teacher Development and Socialization *Andrew Barfield, Paul A. Beaufait, Sean Conley, Tim Murphey, & Katsura Haruko*

語学教師教育研究部会第２回年次コロキアムは、教職課程の学生及び現役の教員の所属の教育機関の内外で、あるいはディスタンスラーニングなど、どのような方法で自己研鑽することができるのかを問うものであった。コロキアムではまず、４名の発表者によるポスターセッションが同時進行的におこなわれ、参加者は実際に発表者個別に意見交換を行った。引き続いてグループディスカッション、及び全体討議が行こなわれた。本論文は４名の発表者の内容をまず、1）教職課程の学生が教員になるプロセスについて、2）教員の所属する教育機関がどのように教員を形づくりまた教員が機関を構築していくかについて、3）教員の遠隔教育においてジャーナルを交換することの意義、4）教員養成におけるビデオ録画リスクロギングの効果、を順番で述べたものである。

Questions about Teaching? Answers from Teachers! *David Cozy, Atsuko Kashiwagi, Eugenia Medrano-Endo, Christopher Jon Poel, Spencer Weatherly*

５人の発表者は合わせて６０年にわたる教育現場での経験があるが、まだ経験が浅かった頃、身近に様々な質問に答えられる先輩の教師がいなかった事を残念に思っている。例えば、「どうしたら学生に発言をさせる事ができるのか。」といった教室内でのことから、「自分の学校の教育法には賛成できないのだが、どうしたら良いのか。」のような職場に関する質問、また「語学の教室では学生の母国語の使用は一切禁止すべきなのか。」といったより根本的な質問だ。５人が日本で教える事について全てを知りつくしているとは言えないが、このラウンド・テーブルでは、発表者自身が得た経験に基づいて、出席者からの質問に答えていった。

What Makes a Good Language Lesson (Part 2) *Stephen M. Ryan*

この研究プロジェクトの第一部（Ryan, 1996）の時に学生５００人以上に次の質問を聞きました：今まで一番良かった英語の授業について書いて下さい。学生の答えをまとめて分析しました。今回の第二部では日本で教えている語学の教師に同じような質問を聞きました。教師の答えもまとめて分析しました。
その結果を表を使って説明をします。多くの教師がstudent-centered approachを目標にしています。
学生の答えと教師の答えを比べます。学生と教師の意見の間には大きな差が見えますが、研究のやり方にいくつか問題点があって、差が研究のやり方から来ているかもしれません。
今予定している研究プロジェクトの第三部も説明します。

Understanding Instructions Survey: Less Anxiety, More Interaction *Duane Kindt*

この調査は、授業中の生徒の不安を取り除くことに重点を置いたプロジェクト、アクションリサーチプロジェクトの一環として始まりました。調査内容は後に改訂されトライデントスクールオブランゲージ（名古屋）の生徒１００人以上を対象に行われました。著者はここに改訂後の調査を紹介し、調査結ä を簡潔に述べるものであります。

More Students Account for their Poor English skills *Lana Yuen*

「英会話のはずだったのにあまり会話をしなかった。」これは、大学生が英会話のコースを評価するよう求められたときにしばしば口にする苦情である。「でも私は英